

STAT

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A16THE WASHINGTON POST
22 December 1981

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Looking at the CIA

As I am in my Arizona home, recuperating from a hip operation, I don't get to see The Post as regularly as I do in Washington. I do have, however, an editorial clipping from the Dec. 6 issue entitled "Mr. Reagan and the CIA." The editorial insinuates, as many editorialists continue to do around this country, that the agency got out of hand in the '60s and '70s, and I would once again like to bring The Post's attention to the truth of the matter.

Yes, the agencies did get out of hand as far as their purpose prescribed by law is concerned. But they got out of hand because the president of the United States at that particular time ordered the CIA to do certain things that were completely outside the area of its responsibility. When the commander in chief orders, the troops react or they get out; in this case, they chose to stay in and attempt to follow the orders. I feel this was a mistake because no president—or should I say commander in chief—should have the power to order any agency to violate the law. Let's pray that that never happens again.

As chairman of the Senate Intelligence Oversight Committee, I am most happy with the order that the presi-

dent signed. Personally, I don't think it goes far enough; but it goes far enough to get things done, and that's what we must do. Remember, and remember this well: all of the enemies of the United States do not live outside its borders; we have quite a number within our own.

BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senator (R-Ariz.)

Phoenix

In The Post's Dec. 8 issue, there is a story about former CIA director Stansfield Turner and the new executive order governing the intelligence community ["Ex-CIA Director Faults New Intelligence Order," A2]. While Adm. Turner is well within his rights to voice his opinions concerning the content of the executive order, I seriously question his criticism of the process. In the story, he is quoted as saying that he deplored the consultation and advice the Reagan administration received from the Senate intelligence committee. "The Congress is now co-opted," he said.

What I find so ironic is that, at the very beginning of his tenure as CIA director, Adm. Turner was involved with the Senate intelligence committee in drafting the Carter administration's

executive order governing the intelligence community. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee was thoroughly involved with Adm. Turner and his representatives in proposing, creating and assessing the rules and regulations that govern intelligence activities on behalf of this country. There were many occasions when Adm. Turner expressed his feelings that the consultative process with the Senate was a very valuable system that should be continued.

On top of this, his statement that the rest of the members of Congress who are not members of the intelligence committee should be "furious," flies in the face of his own sentiments. During his tenure, he was one of the leading proponents of restricting dealings with Congress to the two intelligence committees that, by the way, have developed a very good reputation among their colleagues for handling matters in this very sensitive area.

If Adm. Turner has had a change of heart since his departure, then I think it would have been appropriate for him to preface his remarks with that caveat.

EARL D. EISENHOWER
Washington